

**REMARKS**

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the above changes to the claims and the following remarks, which are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed July 14, 2009.

**I. Status of the Claims**

In the Office Action, Claims 2, 5, 6, 11-16 and 22-29 were noted as pending in the application and were rejected. As a result of this response, Claims 2, 13, 28 and 29 have been canceled, Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 14-16 and 22-27 remain pending and Claims 12, 22 and 23 have been amended in order to further clarify the claimed invention.

**II. Claim Rejections**

**a. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 5, 12-15, 22-24, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,834,299 issued to Hamilton, II et al. ("*Hamilton*") in view of U.S. Publication 2001/0047460 issued to Kobayashi et al. ("*Kobayashi*") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,082,462 issued to Matsunami et al. ("*Matsunami*") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,494 issued to Cheston et al. ("*Cheston*"). (Office Action, page 2). In addition, Claims 2, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi*, *Matsunami* and *Cheston*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,728 issued to Branson et al. ("*Branson*"). (*Id.* at page 10). Claims 6 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi*, *Matsunami* and *Cheston*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,478 issued to Anand et al. ("*Anand*"). (*Id.* at page 11). Finally, Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi*, *Matsunami* and *Cheston*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,287 issued to Kumar et al. ("*Kumar*"). (*Id.* at page 12).

**b. Independent Claims 12, 22 and 23**

As noted above, independent Claims 12, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi*, *Matsunami* and *Cheston*. (Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that neither *Hamilton* nor *Kobayashi*, nor *Matsunami*, nor *Cheston*, whether considered alone or in combination, teaches, suggests or renders obvious each of the recitations of Applicant's independent Claim 12, 22 or 23.

**i. References do not teach "database comprising ..."**

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited teach, suggest or render obvious accessing, or a control station configured to access, a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier (e.g., a WWN) of each of a plurality of diskless host computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up a configuration corresponding to an identifier (e.g., a WWN) received from a diskless host computer, wherein the configuration identifies the operating system associated with the diskless host computer, as recited, albeit in somewhat different language, in each of Applicant's independent Claims 12, 22 and 23.

In response to Applicant's arguments of the previous response, the Examiner argues that "applicant also argues in substance, that *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi* in further view of *Matsunami* does not explicitly teach the configuration identifies the operating system associated with the PC ... the Office disagrees, *Hamilton*, claims 1, 6, teaches identifying an at least one of Solaris, OS, AIX OS, and Windows NT OS." (Office Action, page 13). Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has mischaracterized Applicant's argument. In particular, Applicant argues, not that none of the references teach or suggest a configuration identifying an operating system, as suggested by the Examiner, but that none of the references teach or suggest *a database* comprising a correspondence between an identifier ... and a configuration ... [that] identifies the operating system," and, therefore, that none of the references teach or suggest accessing such a database, as recited in Applicant's independent Claims 12, 22 and 23.

As previously noted, the Office Action appears to rely on *Matsunami* for this teaching. (Office Action, page 4). According to *Matsunami*, each Personal Computer (PC) 2 of the Computer System disclosed has a “Fibre Channel Interface (Fibre Channel I/F) 22 to connect the PC 2 to the Fibre Channel[.]” (*Matsunami*, col. 3, lines 37-61). “The Fibre Channel I/F 22 is composed of ... Memory Unit 221 ... [which contains] the Boot-up Control Program 2211 ... and World Wide Name (WWN) 2212 which is an unique name to identify the Fibre Channel I/F 22.” (*Id.* at col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 11).

The Computer System of *Matsunami* further includes a Storage Subsystem 1 “equipped with ... Logical Units (LUs) 170 through 176 storing programs and data utilized by PC 2.” (*Id.* at col. 4, lines 19-27). In particular, the “OS program which PC 2 uses is stored in a specific LU which is allocated for each PC 2.” (*Id.* at col. 8, lines 16-18). According to *Matsunami*, “[e]ach of the LUs 170 through 176 is given a specific number called Logical Unit Number (LUN) to be uniquely identified. Usually the Computer including PC searches a Storage Subsystem for available LUs during the OS Boot-up ... [and] accessible LUs are allocated for each PC 2.” (*Id.* at col. 4, lines 49-59).

The Storage Subsystem 1 of *Matsunami* further includes a Memory Unit that “stores LU Definition Program 131 [and] LUN Management Table 132[.]” (*Id.* at col. 4, lines 20-39). According to *Matsunami*, the “LUN Management Table 132 contains Computer Identifier 1321 ... Virtual LUN 1324, [and] Internal LUN 1325 ... corresponding to said Computer Identifier 1321 ... [wherein t]he Computer Identifier 1321 ... is defined by a combination of Port Name based on the WWN information 2212 of the Fibre Channel I/F 22 of the PC 2 and S\_ID (Source-ID) which is fixed in an initialization procedure of the Fibre Channel.” (*Id.* at col. 6-18).

As described above, *Matsunami* discloses a table (i.e., the LUN Management Table) that includes a correspondence between a PC’s unique identifier (i.e., the Computer Identifier) and the number associated with the logical unit allocated to that PC (i.e., the internal and logical LUN), wherein the logical unit stores the operating system associated with the PC. In other words, the table of *Matsunami* defines *where the operating system associated with the PC is stored*; the table does not define *a configuration* associated with the PC, wherein the

configuration actually identifies the operating system associated with the PC. Put differently, the LUN Management Table does not define the operating system (e.g., SOLARIS 8, LINUX, AIX, etc.) associated with the PC; rather, the LUN Management Table defines where the operating system is stored. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Matsunami* does not teach or suggest “accessing a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier [e.g., a WWN] of each of a plurality of diskless host computers and *a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer* in order to look up a configuration corresponding to the received identifier ... [e.g., the obtained WWN], said configuration *identifying the operating system associated with the diskless host computer*[.]” as recited, albeit in somewhat different language, in Applicant’s independent Claims 12, 22 and 23, as amended. (Applicant’s Claim 12, *emphasis added*).

*Hamilton, Kobayashi* and *Cheston* likewise fail to teach or suggest “accessing a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier [e.g., a WWN] of each of a plurality of diskless host computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up a configuration corresponding to the received identifier ... [e.g., the obtained WWN], said configuration identifying the operating system associated with the diskless host computer[.]”

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references, whether considered alone or in combination, teach, suggest or render obvious each of the recitations of Applicant’s independent Claim 12, 22 or 23 and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**ii. References do not teach or suggest “operating system ... is altered”**

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited teach, suggest or render obvious “wherein the operating system copied to the storage device from another device ... is altered based on one or more requirements associated with the diskless host computer,” which is recited, albeit in somewhat different language, in each of independent Claims 12, 22 and 23, as amended. The Office Action cites *Branson* for this teaching (Office Action, page 10). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Branson* does not teach, suggest

or render obvious altering *an operating system*. In contrast, *Branson* discloses updating “*a program that runs on ... [the] operating system*” on “all computers in the network that are running a particular operating system” (*Branson*, col. 1, lines 38-42, *emphasis added*), not altering the operating system itself. Accordingly, *Branson* does not teach, suggest or render obvious “wherein the operating system copied to the storage device from another device ... is altered based on one or more requirements associated with the diskless host computer,” as recited, albeit in somewhat different language in each of dependent Claims 13, 28 and 29.

For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references, whether considered alone or in combination, teach, suggest or render obvious each of the recitations of Applicant’s independent Claim 12, 22 or 23 and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**c. Dependent Claims 2, 5, 6, 11, 13-16 and 24-29**

Dependent Claims 2, 13, 28 and 29 have been canceled. The rejection of these claims is, therefore, moot. With regard to the remaining dependent claims, Claims 14-16; 5, 6 and 11; and 24-27 depend, respectively, from independent Claims 12, 22 and 23 and include all of the recitations of their base claims and any intervening claims plus their additional recitations that further distinguish the art applied in the rejection. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claims 12, 22 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 5, 6, 11, 14-16 and 24-27 are further patentable over the references cited in the Office Action as such dependent claims now depend from allowable base claims

**III. Conclusion**

In light of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer F. Miller/  
Jennifer F. Miller  
Registration No. 56,278

Ballard Spahr LLP  
Customer Number 23859  
(678) 420-9300  
(678) 420-9301 (fax)